DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 208 SP 031 094

AUTHOR Clandinin, D. Jean; Connelly, F. Michael
TITLE Narrative, Experience and the Study of Curriculum.
SPONS AGENCY Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies, Edmonton.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 25p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; *Curriculum Development; *Experiential Learning; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Holistic Approach; *Personal Narratives; Story Telling; Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Interns; *Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS Alberta (Calgary)

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the role of imagination, experience, and narrative recounting of practical events in the education of novice teachers. The narrative study of experience connects autobiography to action and intentional future; it connects these to social history and direction; and it links the pluralistic extremes of formalism to the concreteness of specific actions. This discussion rethinks curriculum and teaching in terms of a narrative inquiry which draws on classroom observation and participant observation of the practical, along with the bringing forward of personal experience in the form of stories, interviews, rules, principles, images, and metaphors. The focus of the paper is on how a narratively understood curriculum for teacher education meshes with a curriculum for the teacher's students. It is pointed out that practical knowledge is learned through apprenticeship to a master and this form of learning has some advantages over "book" learning. It is in the laboratory, combined with the best of apprenticeship, that practice is learned as a whole and experientially. To illustrate this point, a case study is presented of the experiences of an intern teacher and her cooperating teacher. The implications for teacher education programs are discussed. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306208

NARRATIVE, EXPERIENCE AND THE STUDY OF CURRICULUM

D. Jean Clandinin
University of Calgary

F. Michael Connelly
OISE/University of Toronto

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Clandinin

M. Connelly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

This work was supported by the Alberta Advisory Council on Educational Studies and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

SP 031 094

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NARRATIVE, EXPERIENCE AND THE STUDY OF CURRICULUM

The speed with which Schon's (1983, 1987) recent works penetrated the reference lists of teacher education writers has been remarkable. Partly, we can explain the phenomenon as resulting from Schon's work as fitting among ongoing lines of inquiry into reflection, practice, and their combination. There is another reason, less tangible and more a question of, to borrow a term from Eisner, the educational imagination (Eisner, 1979). We see the practices Schon describes as part of the folklore of teacher education, matters kept alive in staffroom discussion, but often referred to negatively outside of schools as the 'telling of war stories' and as accounts of mere 'learning-by-doing'. These accounts are frequently seen by 'scientifically' minded teacher educators as something to be cleansed from student and novice teachers' minds in an attempt to pave the way for more 'scholarly' norms of teaching. The remnants of these discredited practices remain in the Canadian (and perhaps, American) imagination as the kind of education that was acceptable in the less scientific days of teacher education gone by. Schon's books, we like to think, gave modern value to these professional memories.

Schon, of course, does not use temporality, history and memory, to make his case. Rather, his logic consists of a reasoned case against 'technical rationalism' designed to cleanse the novice professional mind, combined with the presentation of case evidence of good educational practice in the professions. But the explanation of why his rhetorical influence in education is all out of proportion to his argument's substance can be explained narratively. Schon makes it possible for many of us to tell the story of teacher education in a way

that runs counter to the technical teacher education we are encouraged to sponsor, and study, and he makes it possible for the story to value our professional memory of reflective practice.

What makes this retelling of the story possible is the sense of reductionism entailed in the idea of technical rationalism. The image of professional practice, held in professional memory and rejected in scholarly discourse, is the thing that has been reduced. A rich whole, for us the professional memory, has been reduced through technical rationalism to a formulated set of rules which "may then be written in a book" (Oakeshott, 1962) (or, we might add, embodied in a master professor or teacher) and taught (or copied through role modeling and education's version of 'coaching') to novices. Johnson (1987), in his recent book "The Body in the Mind', wrote that "without imagination nothing in the world could be meaningful. Without imagination we could never make sense of our experience" (p.ix). The success of Schon's work, we believe, is precisely that it tapped the professional imagination and permitted a reconstruction of the idea of education. It is not only "that none of the theories of meaning and rationality dominant today offer any serious treatment of imagination" (Johnson, 1987, p.ix), it is also the case that imagination is mostly ignored in studies of education. For Johnson, the set of reasons which account for this state of affairs in philosophy is captured by the term 'objectivism', which he metaphorically defines as the "god's-eye-view about what the world really is like" (p.x). It is a view that implies that no matter what any particular person happens to believe about it, there is a correct and true view of the world. It is a depersonalized notion of truth and meaning. The god's-eye-view, say Oakeshott and

Schon, has become, in studies of the practical, technical rationalism. Technical rationalism is:

> the assertion that what I have called 'practical knowledge' is not knowledge at all, the assertion that properly speaking there is no knowledge that is not technical knowledge. The rationalist holds that the only element of knowledge involved in human activity is technical knowledge and what I have called 'practical knowledge' is really only a sort of neoscience which would be negligible if it were not positively mischievous. A sovereignty of 'reason', for the Rationalist means the sovereignty of technique. The heart of the matter is the pre-occupation of the Rationalist with certainty (Oakeshott, 1962).

Johnson sees the way of reuniting what the god's-eye-view and technical rationalism have separated and reduced is by "putting the body back into the mind" (Johnson, 1987, p.xxxvi). A disembodied mind permits the certainty needed by technical rationalism. To put the body back into the mind is to wreck havoc with certainty. Emotion, value, felt experience with the world, memory and narrative explanations of one's past do not stand still in a way that allows for certainty.

The suspicion of experience is not the suspicion born of a scientific mind for, as Oakeshott (1962) shows, science, no less than art, is incapable of being reduced to technique and taught out of a book. Those who argue against the study of practice, and the imaginative and narratively generated diversity that goes with it, often define practice as the execution of skills and, ironically, they often argue that to discover and name the skills is to do science. But it is reductionism, and what Dewey (1938) called the "quest for certainty" that marks the technical rationalist, and not the doing of science. The doing of science is compatible with narrative and the study of practice in all of its imaginative complexity.

Oakeshott remarks that "the rationalist has taken an ominous interest in education. He has a respect for 'brains', a great belief in training them, and is determined that cleverness shall be encouraged and shall receive its reward of power" (Oakeshott, 1962, p.32). It is "ominous" because the technical rationalist "has no sense of the accumulation of experience, only of the readiness of experience when it is being converted into a formula: the past is significant to him only as an encumberence" (Oakeshott, 1962, p.2). A person with experience is considered, by the technical rationalist, to have "negative capability" (Oakeshott, 1962, p.2). If the "tabula rasa has been defaced by the irrational scribblings of tradition-ridden ancestors" (Oakeshott, 1962, p.5) and, one might add, by the experiences of life to date, then, says Oakeshott, the first educational task of the rationalist "must be to rub the slate clean" (Oakeshott, 1962, p.5). The technical rationalist's interest in educational is ominous not because it ignores experience but because experience is seen as a deterrent to the 'true' skilled education. In a line that might have been written by Dewey (1938) with respect to his idea of the reconstruction of experience as the foundation of education, Oakeshott writes that "as with every other sort of knowledge, learning a technique does not consist in getting rid of pure ignorance, but in reforming knowledge which is already there" (Oakeshott, 1962, p.12). Schon picks up this theme in his work on professional education by legitimating our professional memory and making it possible to return to experience, not as a black mark on the mental slate, but as a resource for the education of professionals including teachers.

There is another story at work in the rescuing of a professional image of practice, experience and narrative. Schon and Oakeshott

permit us to imagine a Johnson retelling of "the body in the mind", and, metaphorically, to return 'upward to the whole from the technical rationalist's reduced world of skilled practice. There is another retelling of the story 'downward' to the whole from a paradigmatic socio-political analysis. Just as reductionism makes the whole into something lesser, sociological and political analysis can also make the whole lesser through the use of abstraction and formalism. The disputes between experientialist wholists and those promulgating formalistic lines of inquiry are no less dramatic, although far less widespread, than those between experiential wholists and technical rationalists. The latter disputes are more widely known throughout the educational literature partly because experiential wholists have imagined technical rationalists as the only, or at least the main, opponent of experience in the study and doing of education. But as the arguments in the curriculum literature between experientialists and formalists make clear, the study of practice, experience and narrative is equally mistrusted in formalism as it is in technical rationalism. Our own work on narrative (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988a, 1988b) has recently come under criticism from both sources, technical rationalism and formalism.

The formalists' argument has been supported from two quite different sources, the study of literature and the philosophy of science. In a discussion of the issues at work, Bernstein (1987) remarks that "it has become increasingly fashionable to speak of our time as a 'postera' - 'postmodernity', 'poststructuralist', 'postempericist', postwestern', and even 'postphilosophic' - but nobody seems to be able to properly characterize this 'postera' - and there is an inability and an anxiety in the naming of it" (Bernstein, 1987,

pp.516-517). This confusion of the theoretical mind is "a reflection of what's happening in our everyday lives where there is a spread of almost wild pluralism" (Bernstein, 1987, p.517). "Wild pluralism" is another way of naming the relativism that troubles Booth (1986) in literary criticism and is an expression of what Popper called the "myth of the framework" (Bernstein, 1987, p.56). It is a formalistic view; a view that things are never what they are but are, rather, what our framework or point of view or perspective or outlook makes of them. Further, since nothing is as it seems, the only thing worth noticing is the terms, the formal structures, by which things are perceived. One does not teach, one mindlessly reproduces a social structure; one does not have emotionally credited intentions, one has preset expectations; one does not have experience that is one's own, one merely moves forward by contextual design. Formalists say that the facts of the case, the experiences one claims to have, or the data collected by empiricist researchers, have little bearing on their claims. A person, they argue, can never see themselves as they are since they are always something else, specifically, they are whatever social structure, ideology or framework is at work in the inquiry. What we have called the whole (the practical, experience and narrative) is, accordingly, as suspect for the formalist as it is for the technical rationalist. The difference between the two is the place given experience. For the technical rationalist, experience is a black mark on the slate to be wiped clean; for the formalist, experience is something to be ignored. For the formalist, there is, in the end, no agency in experience but only in form. For the formalist, a person merely plays out the hegemonies of politics, culture, gender and framework.

Bernstein's task, it might be argued, is to revivify, in the modern age, Deweyan thought which might, as he says, "through communal critical inquiry" (Bernstein, 1987, p.511), permit a drawing together of the meanings of both technical rationalism and formalism within a theory of experience. As Bernstein remarks "Dewey had a strong sense of both the historicity and the contextualism of all inquiry and experience" and was opposed to the pluralistic "myth of the framework" which "suggests that 'we are prisoners caught in the framework of our theories; our expectations; our past experience; our language'" (Bernstein, 1987, p.511). "Inquiry" into teacher education, in the Bernstein-Dewey view, is, at one and the same time, historical and contextual; likewise, the "experience" of teacher education is at once historical (and therefore personal) and contextual. A person being educated is a person with an experiential history which a theory of experience neither wipes away nor ignores as irrelevant. A person being educated is all of these things at one and the same time. This is the task of the narrative study of schooling in which we and others are engaged. And because narrative is a way of talking about Dewey's reconstruction of experience or Oakeshott's "reforming knowledge which is already there" (Oakeshott, 1962, p.12) it is considered ill-advised for study by the technical rationalist. Likewise, because narrative is a reconstruction of a person's experience in relation to others and to a social milieu, it is under suspicion as not representing the true context and the proper "postera" by formalists. With a wry sense of irony, we observe that technical rationalists and formalists are joined in common cause against the study of experience.

Schon's service to professional memory, therefore, reaches beyond his grasp. The practical imagination needed support not only from the

losses of reductionism, that is, a loss of wholistic identity in technical rationalism, but also from the losses of the concrete and material, that is, in the excesses of contextualism and formalism. By writing books which embody a concrete conception of the practical, Schon's reach exceeded his anti-reductionist grasp. Unwittingly, to reverse Johnson's epigram (1987), Schon 'put the mind back into the body'. The narrative study of experience brings body to mind and mind to body; it connects autobiography to action and an intentional future; it connects these to social history and direction; and it links the pluralistic extremes of formalism to the concreteness of specific actions.

Narrative thought, that is, how one goes about thinking narratively, has several possibilities. Traditional fields of inquiry offer paradigmatic narrative modes as, for example, in history, literature, biography, philosophy, psychotherapy and so forth. Ours is but one possibility within several and is in education (Baker and Greene, 1987; Enns-Connolly, 1985; Britzman, in press; Bruner, 1986). Our own work, perhaps more prosaically "practical" than most, is to rethink curriculum and teaching in terms of a narrative inquiry which draws on classroom observation and participant observation of the practical, along with the bringing forward of personal experience in the form of stories, interviews, rules, principles, images, and metaphors (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988a).

The Teacher as Curriculum Topic

In a Dewey (1938) inspired essay on forms of inquiry, Schwab (1962) showed how, in the social and physical sciences, the study of the whole vies for place amid downward (reductionistic) and upward (formalistic) modes of explanation. Our discussion of the study of

experience is set forth in order to show where the study of experience fits within what Schwab called the "forms of principles for inquiry" (p.186) in educational studies. Admittedly, the term 'experience' does not make a study wholistic. But 'experience' designates the principal phenomenon that marks the relevant whole, an individual person being educated. Narrative, which we have defined as "the making of meaning from personal experience via a process of reflection in which storytelling is the key element and in which metaphors and folk knowledge take their place" (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988b, p.16), is our conception of the whole. Narrative is temporal, past, present and future, and, as in all storytelling, is a reconstruction of experience. It is a putting of 'the mind in the body' and 'the body in the mind'. The whole, for us, is the narrative that each person tells of herself/himself, or that is told through processes of inquiry. This is not the place to detail the quality of narrative or of a narrative except to say that, properly done, it countenances the full implications of what Johnson (1987) intended by putting the body in the mind and its reverse. In narrative inquiry, just as in reading any text, there are multiple possible narratives and/or narrative threads and the judgement of whether or not one is 'telling the truth' has to do with criteria such as adequacy, possibility, depth, and sense of integrity. There is no "quest for certainty" in the writing of narrative and so there is a basic opposition in principle between the wholistic ends of narrative inquiry, the reductionistic ends of technical rationalist inquiry and the generalized and abstract ends of formalistic inquiry.

Our particular approach to curriculum requires that a further point be made before we bring forward illustrative case material. The

so called commonplaces are widely acknowledged as specifying the 'topics' of curriculum discourse. We know of no argument to deny the forceful legitimacy of student, teacher, learner, and milieu as integral parts of an adequate discussion of curriculum. Some, such as Ben-Peretz (1986), would add to the list but none, to our knowledge, would subtract. Generally speaking, learner, subject matter and milieu are well represented in the literature. But in most of the literature, the teacher as a focus for curriculum discourse tends to be minimized and treated in derivative ways. At the risk of oversimplifying, many milieu curriculum arguments tend to treat the teacher as an unconscious reproducer of inequitable social structures; many subject matter arguments demand rationalistic disciplinary training of teachers; and learner based arguments tend to see the teacher as nurturer. In almost all such curriculum proposals "teacher retraining" is tacked on to the more central topic. Our work puts the teacher in the forefront and constructs a teacher based curriculum argument. It is an argument which conceptually meshes a curriculum for teacher education with a curriculum for those taught.

Our overall argument is constructed on two assumptions, one of which we assert and the other one of which we shall both argue to and from. We assume that studies of school reform, and resistance to it, yield a view of teacher agency such that curriculum plans, whether of milieu, subject matter or learner, founder or prevail on the activities of the teacher. We assume that in the curricular event, it is teachers that reproduce or revolutionize social structures, communicate or reinterpret curriculum context, and cooperate with, or act in opposition to, the nature of their student charges. In short, we

propose to entertain the consequences of adopting a teacher topic for curriculum discourse.

The assumption we propose to argue from, and with, might be defined as the assumption of experience and the uses of narrative. We want to rethink the possibilities and potential in Dewey's (1938) idea of experience. As we reflect on experience it is, to us, a remarkable anomoly that general and rhetorical writings on curriculum, textbooks and the like, make experience a key term; likewise, in our everyday discourse about education, the word experience (Deweyian or otherwise) is so common as to be what Schutz and Luckmann (1973) might call the 'unexamined ground of the natural world view of a curricularist'. Yet, when we turn to curriculum inquiry, especially that branch of curriculum inquiry that refers to teachers, it is as if experience is of little importance to education.

In the remainder of this paper, we bring these two sets of assumptions together. We show how a narratively understood curriculum for teacher education meshes with a curriculum for the teacher's students.[1] In our recent book (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988a), we wrote of this idea as 'the teacher's curriculum as a metaphor for the curriculum of the teacher's students'.

The Internship: Laboratory and Apprenticeship

Oakeshott (1962) argued against a technical-rationalist view that practical knowledge could be formulated as a set of rules, principles, directions and maxims that could be recorded in a book and taught to novices. On the contrary, he says, "it is a characteristic of practical knowledge that it is not susceptible to a formulation of this kind" (Oakeshott, 1962, p.10). He argues that "practical knowledge can neither be taught nor learned, but only imparted and acquired. It

exists only in practice" (Oakeshott, 1962, p.11). Practical knowledge is learned through apprenticeship to a master. Undoubtedly, such an education has great advantages over 'the book' as an education in practice. But taken to its extreme in teacher education, apprenticeship to a master simply replaces the authority of the technical-rationalist's 'book' with the authority of the cooperating teacher.

The principal criticism of this form of apprenticeship in the education of teachers was advanced by Dewey (1898) in his distinction between the laboratory and apprenticeship in teacher education. For Dewey, the laboratory is an occasion for problem-formulation and solution which permits the novice teacher not only to absorb the norms of practice, as in apprenticeship, but also to think for him or herself, to be reflective and, therefore, to culture the seeds of reform. It is in the laboratory, combined with the best of apprenticeship, that practice is learned as a whole, experientially and with the possibility for reconstruction such that the bonds of biography and culture can be stretched and broken. The potential of the internship for these purposes is seen in the following case study work between Clandinin and an intern teacher, Marie,[2] and her cooperating teacher, Ellen.

The Teacher/Participant

At the time field records were made, Marie was in her first year of teaching as part of an internship program. She completed a B.Ed. After Degree in Early Childhood Education following a B.A. and most of an M.A. in English literature. Marie lived and was educated in different countries as her family was transferred from place to place. She worked in industry for a period of time and then returned to

university to pursue teacher education. She was a student in a teacher education class Clandinin taught. She did her primary division student teaching in a class taught by a woman who did a great deal of classroom drama including choral reading, readers' theatre, improvisation and role playing. This is the student teaching experience about which Marie most often talks. She went back to work with this teacher as a volunteer whenever she had time during the two years of her teacher education program.

Marie's internship was in a small school situated in a upper middle class area in a large urban area. She was assigned to a class and a teacher in a new program which combined grade one and kindergarten students. The grade one students attended the program all day and the kindergarten children attended in the afternoon. The cooperating teacher had not taught grade one previously but had considerable teaching experience in kindergarten. Marie was selected for this internship position because she had particular strength in grade one as judged by her student teaching experience. The program was a "model" program and was closely monitored by the school board.

Curriculum of Teacher Education

Marie was involved in the internship program in a teacher education setting which had some of the features of what we imagine might be contained in a reflective practicum for teacher education. She worked in a classroom with an experienced classroom teacher. As well, she participated in a collaborative way in a research project with Clandinin which contributed, through its methodology, to growth and change. She learned, for the first time on a fulltime basis, how to teach by working in a classroom teaching position. It was an apprenticeship situation with the marks of an internship and a laboratory.

Marie's readiness to depart from the constraints of the apprenticeship is seen in the following set of field notes.

> Marie is in charge of the language arts program in the morning. She recounted one of the stories that she was telling where the students got quite excited. She said that she was glad that Ellen, the cooperating teacher, was not in the room for that. Ellen apparently likes to keep the room quite quiet. Maries likes to let the children get involved in the stories and dramatizations of the stories ... One of Marie's concerns is the non-integrated nature of the day. The subjects are taught as different subject matter and this concerns Marie. She had earlier asked Ellen if they could do a theme on fairy tales. Ellen had said that she did not like themes. Marie sees this as one way of getting some integration into the program (Notes to file, September 11, 1985).

Marie, of course, was not acting entirely on her own initiative in her readiness to break with Ellen's practices. Her preferences for stories and dramatizations are connected to her student teaching assignments with yet another teacher; with her experiences at the university in teacher education; and with her education in English literature. While it would be easy to say that, therefore, Marie was not thinking independently, her situation of different practices in an apprenticeship was, after all, the world of practice familiar to us all. Inevitably, we are called upon to thread our own practical way through an environment of competing, sometimes conflicting, actions of others. How Marie does this through the reconstruction of her own, and her students', narratives, is the story to be told in this set of field notes.

Literature, Drama and Narrative

Even the short excerpt from the field notes quoted above illustrates the wholistic, experiential concern of the novice teacher. Marie's concern for the language arts program, literature,

story-telling and dramatization is held together in her thinking by narrative. She wanted the children to "get involved in the stories and dramatizations" not only, we imagine, because of the added meaning involvement brings to interpretation, but because it is a way to create a meaningful narrative thread in the children's daily program. Like many elementary school teachers, she was concerned at the fragmentation of a day organized according to school subjects. This concern is frequently cast as subject matter in opposition to children but, for Marie, the issue was essentially one of continuity and meaning for the children.

A Reconstruction of Marie's Knowledge

In the first set of field notes, Marie seemed to have little sense of doubt with the possible exception of her concern for the student noise generated by her curriculum. She appeared unworried that her ideas for the language arts program and the use of thematic material was not favoured by Ellen. Her confidence was not only connected to her earlier student teaching placement but also to her theoretical training on the use of thematic material. Her success with themes is illustrated in the following field note.

> She said that she is having some trouble choosing themes. She said that she thought it would be easy to choose themes. She talked about one of the assignments last year in a course when they needed to choose themes for a year. She said she had no trouble at all doing that but now she was having trouble choosing themes within which she can provide meaningful learning. She talked about the work she is doing on the Halloween theme. She said she is surprised she is able to do what she is able to do with it. She said for the children in their community, Halloween is a big thing. She said that the children go out trick-or-treating with their parents in the immediate area and then the parents have a party at someone's home for groups of children. She said she has thought about this and

> sees that Halloween is a significant experience in these children's lives. She talked about being able to link the Halloween theme to ghosts and monsters and how these are the nameless fears of children. She thinks that perhaps that is why it has its power She said that the children are writing about Halloween in their journals (Notes to file, October 21, 1985).

Here, the sense of the problematic characteristic of Dewey's "laboratory" is evident. At first, Marie was simply engaged in the problem of choosing themes but, on reflection, she realized that it was much more difficult for her to choose themes for the class than it was for her to choose themes in the university course. The heart of the issue, again, is narrative. How could she identify thematic material which allowed her curriculum to return children's experience to them in a different way and, hence, for them to tell their own stories in richer and more meaningful ways? A double, or "parallel", narrative was at work, hers and her students'. As Marie began to rethink the idea of 'theme' in terms of her students' experience, rather than in terms of her own, she fastened on Halloween because of its importance of her students. On the one hand, she was retelling, for herself, the role of theme in teaching. But deeper than this, it was interesting to see that her reconstruction of the Halloween theme for the children was that Halloween permitted children to think through their "nameless" fears and it was the dealing with these fears, and the power they have in the children's lives that justified the theme for Marie.

Thus, she was beginning to see things that related to the children's experience, and she was led to different understandings than the one she had in her university class where she chose themes that appealed to her. Now she needed themes that permitted her to build on children's experiences. She found herself working on a Halloween theme

which was very much a part of the community and family experience for the children and she was surprised she found something of importance in Halloween. She rethought not only the idea of 'theme' but the particular theme of Halloween in terms of fears and powers in children's lives. Halloween became an important part of the school curriculum as she thought about its uses and as the children wrote about it in their journals. The second narrative reconstruction was the children's own.

"Transformers" and Reconstruction

Marie's concern for reconstruction in the children's lives as the focus of her curriculum was seen by contrasting Halloween with the children's "transformer" toys. Her concern for the transformer toys was evident in the following field records.

> She then went back to talking about the blocks. (Marie here is referring to the building block center where children build with large construction blocks objects large enough within which to play). She asked how much she could impose on the children. She asked if she could tell them what to build. She told me that the children had been playing for several days with their transformers. (These are a particular kind of plaything, parts of which can be moved and the toy is then 'transformed' into a totally different play thing. For example, a dinosaur could be 'transformed' into the shape of a car by changing some of the parts. There is also a daily cartoon television show about transformers that plays on a local station and that many of the children watch). She said that it was all right dramatic play but it was not as good and not as constructive as when they had played with Goldilocks and the Three Bears. (They had earlier done some work with that story). She had suggested that they build a cottage for the three bears. She said she supposed even then that she had been interfering in their play. I used the word extend their play. They had talked about what they needed to have a cottage and the children had gone ahead and made the cottage. She had said they had put a roof on it and everything ... Apparently, the children, for the first time, had put on a play. They had started to do it with trick or treating

> around Halloween and Marie had asked them how they were going to end it. They had gone off to work on it and the way they ended was that they came home and ate the candy and got a stomach ache. They wanted to present it to the parents. Now they wanted to do lots more plays. Several more children were asking to be involved. She wants to take the idea of Little Red Riding Hood and get the parents' help in making tapes and so on (Notes to file, October 3, 1985).

In the above field note segment, we saw Marie raising questions about the use of the block center and how it fits with children's experience. Marie's focus on children's literature was apparent but she now wondered about children's experience with dramatization and the way it connected with the experience of building props for the dramatizations which she saw happening at the block center. Through the work with the three bears' cottage, the children understood they could create plays of the stories. They began to use their own experiences of Halloween to write a play. It was their experience that became the subject matter for the play.

Essentially, then, Marie rejected the transformer toys, and their television counterparts, in favour of something more thematically connected with the children's lives, Halloween. But she recognized a dilemma since the children were also interested in the transformers. The dilemma was illustrated in the following field notes.

> She again expressed concern about the block play. She said that she is not sure how different it is for the children to be replaying the television experiences in the block center or whether she imposes it. She sees that the culture, via television, imposes it one way and she imposes it the other. She said that she finds the play doesn't go anywhere for some of the students. She talked about the "transformer" stations and she is not too interested. She helped them build a haunted house. She said that they talked about things like Poltergeist. She said that the children could make the walls shake and they had done a very good job of doing it. She said that

> the kindergarten children do it with the Grade 1 children and that is why the kindergarten children are able to do as much as they can (Notes to file, October 21, 1985).

In the above notes, Marie continued to question her work and connected the Halloween experience to the dramatic block play. Again, she connected Halloween to larger supernatural events such as a poltergeist.

> Marie sent them off to get started in the haunted house. She gave the other children their choice of centers and then they walked over and watched the students at the haunted house. They had built a haunted house with the large blocks. They had made a number of masks that were moved up and down. The walls moved which they said was the Poltergeist. They showed this for two or three minutes and the other students clapped. Then they went off to their centers and the children at the block center continued to work on their haunted house (Notes to file, October 22, 1985).

From the field records, it was not at all clear how Marie resolved the dilemma at a conceptual level. But practically, it is clear that she believed there to be more narrative meaning contained in the Halloween dramatization than in the transformer toys and this was the practical route taken. We might well imagine that to the extent that Dewey's sense of the laboratory continued to pervade the internship that Marie will come back to questions such as this just as she reconstructed her idea of a theme and of the particular theme, Halloween. But whether or not this eventually occurred, we see how Marie's own narrative of experience drove her partly to reflect upon and think out the curriculum for her students and to act out a curriculum partly in accordance with what she had thought out, and partly in accordance with the underlying narrative beliefs she had about experience, themes, intergration and meaning for her children. Thus, Marie has reconstructed her idea of curriculum, and, therefore,

in the humble way possible in the ongoing business of schooling, was able to break the bonds of her own university and apprenticeship experience. She had, in effect, broken away from social, theoretical and personal bonds in rethinking her ideas of curriculum. Meanwhile, the students reconstructed their curriculum by deliberately creating a play - a story - in which they were actors. Thus, they not only lived out the story of Halloween, but they saw themselves as participants in the story. It is in storying ourselves that it is possible to remake experience.

Educational Entailments

When we think of life as a story, we are given a measure, however modest, of control. We gain a measure of freedom from the prisons of biography and social form. This short vignette of Marie's classroom curriculum and Marie's teacher education curriculum exhibits the sense in which it is possible to imagine reform in the school curriculum through reform in the curriculum for teacher education. We see in microcosm the power of narrative and how it is both lived out unconsciously, and is deliberately imagined, thereby yielding reform and reconstruction in our lives. Neither the hegemonies of form nor the technical constraints of maxim and rule, nor even the bonds of autobiography are safe from the reconstructions of narrative.

Footnotes

[1] The illustrations for this paper are drawn from a two year narrative study by Clandinin with a beginning teacher.

[2] Marie and Ellen are pseudonyms used to protect the anonymity of the two teachers.

Bibliography

Baker A and Greene, E. 1987. Storytelling. Art and Technique. New York: R.R. Bowker Company.

Ben-Peretz, M. 1986. "Time: The fifth commonplace in curriculum deliberations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association meetings. San Francisco, April, 1986.

Bernstein, R. 1987. "The varieties of pluralism." American Journal of Education, 95, 4, 509-525.

Booth, W.C. 1986. "Pluralism in the classroom." Critical Inquiry, 12, Spring, 468-479.

Britzman, D. In press. "Who has the floor?: Curriculum, teaching and the English student teacher's struggle for voice." Curriculum Inquiry.

Bruner, J. 1986. Actual minds, possible worlds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Connelly, F. Michael and Clandinin, D. Jean 1988a. Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience. New York: Teachers College Press.

Connelly, F. Michael and Clandinin, D. Jean (1988b). "Narrative meaning: Focus on teacher education." Elements, xix, 2, 15-18.

Dewey, J. 1938. Logic: The theory of inquiry. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Dewey, J. 1938. Experience and education. New York: Collier Books.

Eisner, E.W. 1979. The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs. New York: Macmillan.

Enns-Connolly, E. 1985. Translation as interpretive act: A narrative study of translation in university-level foreign language teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

Johnson, M. 1987. The body in the mind. The bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reason. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Oakeshott, M. 1962. Rationalism in politics and other essays. London: Methuen.

Schon, D.A. 1983. The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.

Schon, D.A. 1987. Educating the reflective practitioner. London: Jossey-Bass Limited.

Schwab, J.J. 1962. "The teaching of science as inquiry." In J.J. Schwab and P. Brandwein (Eds.). The teaching of science. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schutz, A. and Luckmann, T. 1973. The structures of the life-world. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.